



**Horsham
District
Council**

Representation Form

Horsham Blueprint Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2031

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) - Regulation 16

Horsham Blueprint Neighbourhood Development Plan – Regulation 16 Consultation

Horsham Blueprint Business Neighbourhood Forum (HBBNF) has been preparing a Horsham Blueprint Business Neighbourhood Plan (HBBNP). The Plan sets out a vision for the future of the unparished area of Horsham and planning policies which will be used to determine planning applications locally. In accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 (as amended), the HBBNF and associated supporting documents will go out to consultation from **14 September 2020 to 2 November 2020** for 7 weeks inviting representations on the draft submission plan, basic conditions statement, consultation statement and the Sustainability Statement and HRA screening assessment. Copies of the Horsham Blueprint Business Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents are available to view on the Horsham District Council's website:

<https://www.horsham.gov.uk/planningpolicy/planning-policy/currentconsultations>

Documents will not be made available in deposit locations due to the current COVID-19 pandemic. If local residents have difficulty in engaging online we have provided a telephone number and email address below. This will be on a message service where members of the public are encouraged to leave their details for an officer to contact them back if they need further information.

Email: neighbourhood.planning@horsham.gov.uk – SAS@southdowns.gov.uk

Telephone: 01403 215398

All comments must be received by Midnight on 2 November 2020

There are a number of ways to make your comments:

1. Please use the above web address to view the documents online ; or
2. Complete this form and email it to: neighbourhood.planning@horsham.gov.uk ;

All comments will be publicly available, and identifiable by name and (where applicable) organisation. Please note that any other personal information provided will be processed by Horsham District Council in line the Data Protection Act 1998 and General Data Protection Regulations. Horsham District Council will process your details in relation to this preparation of this document only. For further information please see the Council's privacy policy: <https://www.horsham.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

How to use this form

Please complete Part A in full, in order for your representation to be taken into account at the Neighbourhood Plan examination.

Please complete Part B overleaf, identifying which paragraph your comment relates to by completing the appropriate box.

PART A	Your Details
Full Name	
Address	
Postcode	
Telephone	
Email	
Organisation (if applicable)	n/a
Position (if applicable)	n/a
Date	29/10/2020

PART B

To which part in the plan does your representation relate?

Paragraph Number:	8.20	Policy Reference:	HB11
-------------------	------	-------------------	------

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this plan? (Please tick one answer)

Support

Support with modifications

Object

Comment

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here:

1. Opposition to Policy HB11 Local Green Spaces

I strongly object to the list of sites that have been designated as Local Green Space (LGS) in the Neighbourhood Plan. I also strongly object to the assessment that was made in the Local Green Spaces Review document. I will not support the Neighbourhood Plan unless Muggeridge Field (Site F24) is fairly assessed and designated as a Local Green Space.

The reasons for my opposition are as follows:

1. There is no evidence in the Local Green Spaces Review that views of local residents were taken into account. It appears from this document that the assessments were based solely on the personal views of the Steering Committee and their Working Group. This reflects my personal experience and those of my neighbours.
2. Some of the criteria used to discount sites in stage 1 of the assessment contradict the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). Stage 2 of the assessment should not have been restricted to the examples given in paragraph 100b of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
3. There was no legitimate reason to discount Muggeridge Field in stage 1 of the assessment.
4. Representations were made about Muggeridge Field in the Regulation 14 Consultation. The representations made by local residents were disregarded.
5. Muggeridge Field is a popular local beauty spot, which gives the surrounding area its semi-rural setting. Local residents have asked for it to be protected to retain the unique benefits it provides the community. Despite the fact that Muggeridge Field satisfies all of the criteria in both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG), it hasn't been designated as a Local Green Space by Horsham Blueprint.

1.1. Views of Local Residents were not taken into account.

Horsham Blueprint published their assessment of Local Green Spaces in a document titled "Local Green Spaces Review".

The Local Green Space Review states that the assessment had full regard to the guidance provided in the Locality Toolkit for Local Green Space designations. Section 5 of the Locality Toolkit document emphasises the importance of engaging with the wider community. However, there is no evidence in the Local Green Spaces Review that there was engagement with the wider community as part of their assessment of local green spaces.

Horsham Blueprint carried out a lot of community engagement in the early stages. This is recorded in the evidence base document "Horsham Blueprint Engagement: Consultation Responses, 2017". Lots of comments were made about open spaces but this is not mentioned as a source of information in the Local Green Space Review.

According to the Local Green Spaces Review, they used sources from The Horsham Society and Horsham District Council (HDC) to identify green spaces with additional green spaces identified by the Steering Committee and their Working Group. They then carried out a desktop evaluation to narrow down the list of sites. Finally the Steering Committee and Working Group visited the remaining sites and undertook research into their use and value locally. There is no mention of any engagement with the wider community.

The Locality Toolkit says, *“In particular, it would be useful to ask local people to identify any nearby green spaces that are special to the local community and hold a particular local significance, and to explain in what ways they are special and locally significant.”* There is no evidence that this was done.

From my own personal experience, Horsham Blueprint was not prepared to engage with me. I contacted them numerous times about protection for Muggeridge Field and this was my experience:

- I put forward a suggestion to keep Muggeridge Field as a green space at a drop in session at Bennetts Field in June 2014 (this is recorded in the “Horsham Blueprint Engagement: Consultation Responses, 2017”). I mentioned this again at a display in Swan Walk.
- Following the publication of the draft policies, I sent an email to Horsham Blueprint in September 2018 asking for the protection of Muggeridge Field and giving supporting reasons. I received a reply from the Chair saying that my comment had been forwarded onto the Chair of the Green Spaces Group and the revised policies will be published on the Blueprint website.
- Since I had not heard anything further, I attended the AGM on 28th November 2019 and asked whether Muggeridge Field was going to be protected. I was very alarmed to hear that it wasn’t. Following a discussion involving other attendees, the Chair of the Green Spaces Group said she would look into it further.
- After the AGM, I sent a letter to the Steering Committee by email on 7th December 2019, to: express my concern about the lack of protection for Muggeridge Field; explain in detail why it should be protected; make some suggestions on the protection required, and; offer to assist with plans for the protection of green spaces. I didn’t receive an acknowledgement or a reply. I resent the email to them on 13th December asking if they had received it and still got no response. On the 19th December I sent a message to the consultant who was working with Horsham Blueprint to explain that I had sent a letter to the Steering Group and not received a reply but I never got a response from her either.

Some of my neighbours also contacted Horsham Blueprint about protection for Muggeridge Field in December 2019. They didn’t receive a response either.

The views expressed by myself and my neighbours weren’t recorded and there is no evidence to suggest that they were taken into account as part of the assessment of Local Green Spaces.

Horsham Blueprint stated that their assessment had full regard to the guidance provided in the Locality Toolkit for Local Green Space designations. Yet contrary to this guidance, they seem to have made all of the assessments and decisions regarding Local Green Space designation based on their own personal views, whilst ignoring the views of local residents.

1.2. Assessment of Local Green Spaces doesn’t comply with the NPPF and NPPG.

The Local Green Space Review states, *“The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the paragraphs 99 to 101 of the National Planning Policy Framework dated February 2019 (NPPF). It has also had full regard to the guidance provided in the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) and the Locality Toolkit for Local Green Space designations”*. This statement is not true.

1.2.1 Methodology

Horsham Blueprint split their assessment into 3 stages:

Stage 1 – A desktop assessment of each of the 77 sites against a series of initial criteria to assist in narrowing down the list to those sites that might be suitable for LGS designation.

Stage 2 – Evaluation of shortlisted sites against the NPPF criteria.

Stage 3 – Full descriptions of the proposed Local Green Spaces.

1.2.2 Stage 1 Assessment

The criteria applied for stage 1 were as follows:

1. Does the site have planning permission for development (which would result in the loss of that space) and has construction of that development commenced?
2. Is it agricultural land that is not adjacent to a built-up areas or where there is no public or permissive right of way over it?
3. Is it a verge or other small piece of land on or adjacent to the highway?
4. Is it a strip of land where the only public interest is that a public right of way passes across it?
5. Is the site already protected? Main designations are set out in Figure 3.3.

If the answer to any of these criteria was 'yes', the site was considered unsuitable for LGS designation. The *Local Green Spaces Review* doesn't state how they came up with these criteria. Criteria 1 and 5 correspond to the guidance on Local Green Space designation in the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). However, criteria 2 and 3 contradict this guidance and criterion 4 misrepresents the NPPG:

Criterion 2: With regard to LGS designation, there are no constraints in relation to agricultural land in the NPPF, the NPPG or the Locality Toolkit. The second part of this criteria, which excludes sites "*where there is no public or permissive right of way over it*", is a direct contradiction to the NPPG, which states the complete opposite [NPPG, Paragraph: 017, Reference ID: 37-017-20140306].

Criterion 3: With regard to LGS designation, there are no constraints in relation land on or adjacent to the highway in the NPPF, the NPPG or the Locality Toolkit. The NPPG says "Provided land can meet the criteria at paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework there is no lower size limit for a Local Green Space." [NPPG, Paragraph: 016, Reference ID: 37-016-20140306].

Criterion 4: This criterion has been written in an ambiguous way, which can be misinterpreted. For instance, it could be interpreted as excluding green spaces that have a public right of way across them but have no other use. However, the NPPG is much more specific. It says, "*Areas that may be considered for designation as Local Green Space may be crossed by public rights of way. There is no need to designate linear corridors as Local Green Space **simply to protect rights of way, which are already protected under other legislation.***" [NPPG, Paragraph: 018, Reference ID: 37-018-20140306].

Therefore, I challenge the legitimacy of these three criteria. If these criteria aren't legitimate then some of the sites may have been discounted on a false basis.

1.2.3 Stage 2 Assessment

Paragraph 100b of the NPPF gives examples of what may be considered as "demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance". The stage 2 assessment against paragraph 100b was restricted to these examples. Paragraph 100b makes it clear that these are examples; it doesn't state that they are the only reasons that may be considered.

The Locality Toolkit for Local Green Space designations states that reasons other than the examples can be used. Section 5 says, "*This includes spaces that are special in terms of beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity, wildlife, **or for other reasons.***" Section 8 has a LGS assessment tool; under the NPPF Criteria it says "*Demonstrably special to local community (beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity, wildlife, **or other**)*"

The stage 2 assessment against paragraph 100b should have allowed for reasons other than the examples given in the NPPF.

1.3. Assessment of Muggeridge Field was incorrect.

The *Local Green Spaces Review* identified 77 sites as candidates for LGS designation. Muggeridge Field was included in the sites as “F24 Muggeridge Field open space”. Muggeridge Field was discounted as part of stage 1 but there was no legitimate reason for doing so.

The results of the stage 1 assessment are given in Appendix A of the *Local Green Spaces Review*. For Muggeridge Field (F24), it says:

“Criteria 4 – This is a field located off Athelstan Way owned by West Sussex County Council who have confirmed that it is bound by stock proof fencing and private land signs. In accordance with the West Sussex PROW mapping system, iMaps, neither permissive paths nor formal public rights of way are located within the site. Whilst it is not felt to be suitable for Local Green Space designation, it is included as an important part of the Area’s green infrastructure network.”

The phrase “Criteria 4” means it was discounted because it failed against criterion 4, i.e. it was considered to be “a strip of land where the only public interest is that a public right of way passes across it”. This is clearly incorrect. Muggeridge Field is described as a fenced off area with no public rights of way over it. So criterion 4 is not a legitimate reason to discount it.

As mentioned above, the wording of Criterion 4 misrepresents the wording in the NPPG [*Paragraph: 018, Reference ID: 37-018-20140306*]. However, the actual wording in the NPPG doesn’t apply to Muggeridge Field. So paragraph 018 of the NPPG isn’t a legitimate reason to discount it either.

The comment for Muggeridge Field emphasises that there is no public right of way across it. However, sites can’t be discounted for this reason because it would contradict the NPPG, which states:

*“Some areas that may be considered for designation as Local Green Space may already have largely unrestricted public access, though even in places like parks there may be some restrictions. However, **other land could be considered for designation even if there is no public access** (eg green areas which are valued because of their wildlife, historic significance and/or beauty).”* [NPPG guidance on Local Green Space designation, Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 37-017-20140306]

So the lack of a public right of way over Muggeridge Field is also not a legitimate reason to discount it.

Having read through the sections of the NPPF and NPPG concerned with LGS designation and the Locality Toolkit for LGS designations, I can find no legitimate reason for Muggeridge Field to be discounted. It should have proceeded to stage 2 where it would have been assessed against the NPPF criteria.

1.4. Representations about Muggeridge Field in the Regulation 14 Consultation were disregarded.

Representations were made about Muggeridge Field in the Regulation 14 Consultation.

The following statement was made in the *Local Green Space Review* (section 4.6):

“Muggeridge Field – Many people wrote in to say that they would like this site to be considered as a Local Green Space. It was reviewed as part of the Local Green Space process and was assessed as not meeting the criteria. More detail is provided in the Local Green Space Review.”

However, the representations made by local residents went much further than that.

Local residents made 13 representations about Muggeridge Field [*Consultation Statement – Appendix E*]. They can be broken down as follows:

- 5 only asked for the field to be protected (Refs: 39,92,335,348 and 385)
- 4 gave reasons for protecting the field (Refs: 13, 395, 398 and 404)
- 3 explained how the field satisfied the NPPF criteria (Refs: 54, 396 and 397)
- 1 explained that the criterion used to discount the field was invalid and explained how it actually met all of the NPPF criteria (Ref: 379).

As a collection, these representations should have prompted a re-evaluation of Muggeridge Field. However, in the Consultation Statement (Appendix E), they were all dismissed with a comment saying that Muggeridge Field had been assessed as not meeting the strict requirements of the NPPF criteria for Local Green Spaces.

This was not an adequate response to the points that were being raised. In particular, when a representation says the criterion used to discount the field was invalid, that point should be answered in full.

1.5. Failure to designate Muggeridge Field as a Local Green Space

Muggeridge Field is a popular local beauty spot, which gives the surrounding area its semi-rural setting. Local residents repeatedly asked for it to be protected as a green space to retain the unique benefits it provides the community. They also provided reasons why it meets all of the NPPF criteria for designation as a Local Green Space.

Horsham Blueprint discounted Muggeridge Field on a false basis. They have ignored the views that local residents made about Muggeridge Field throughout the whole process.

Muggeridge Field satisfies all of the criteria in both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). Therefore it should have been designated as a Local Green Space.

The neighbourhood plan is a rare opportunity for local people to ensure there is proper green space provision in their neighbourhood. However, they have been denied the opportunity to protect a green space that holds a local significance and is very special to the community.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

2. Changes required to Policy HB11 and the Local Green Spaces Review document.

The Local Green Spaces Review document should be updated to include a full and fair assessment of Muggeridge Field (site F24), which takes into account the representations made by local residents as part of the Regulation 14 Consultation and representation made as part of the Regulation 16 Consultation. A full and fair summary of the representations made by local residents should be recorded in the Local Green Spaces Review.

If Muggeridge Field is found to satisfy the legitimate criteria for Local Green Space (LGS) designation it should be added to the list of designated LGS in policy HB11. If it isn't designated as a LGS, a full explanation should be included in the Local Green Spaces Review.

2.1. Key requirements for a fair assessment of Muggeridge Field

Muggeridge Field should be assessed directly against the paragraphs 99 to 101 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and paragraphs 005 to 022 of the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). It must not be assessed against criteria that have no legitimacy.

Paragraph 017 of the NPPG [*Reference ID: 37-017-20140306*] makes it clear that land that has no public access **can** be considered for designation as a LGS. So Muggeridge Field can't be discounted on that basis.

The public bridleway on the western side of Muggeridge Field must be taken into consideration as part of the assessment, particularly the assessment against Paragraph 100b of the NPPF. Although it is not within the boundary of site F24, it runs adjacent to the site and is in the same physical field. The site provides the setting for the bridleway and this gives the site high amenity value.

Paragraph 100b of the NPPF gives examples of what may be considered as "demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance". When assessing Muggeridge Field against this criterion, the assessment must not be limited to these examples. [Note: Sections 5 and 8 of the *Locality Toolkit for Local Green Space designations* support the inclusion of other reasons].

2.2. Evidence for the Assessment of Muggeridge Field

2.2.1 Depth of public opinion

Not many people have the time or inclination to review and comment on complex, detailed planning documents. However, when people are face with the prospect of losing their favourite local beauty spot they are suddenly spurred into action. This has been aptly demonstrated in the case of Muggeridge Field. The unparished area of Horsham has a population of over 26,000 but there were only 156 responses to the Regulation 14 consultation on the neighbourhood plan from residents; of those, 13 asked for Muggeridge Field to be protected. Previously, in 2011, West Sussex County Council (WSCC) applied for outline planning permission for housing on Muggeridge Field (DC/11/0224). Over 170 people attended a public meeting at which there was unanimous opposition to the planning application and a total of 257 local residents registered their objection to it.

The representations that people made against this planning application are still on the planning portal and I submit this as evidence of substantial support for the preservation of Muggeridge Field as a green space. The substance of what people said then and what they are saying now hasn't changed.

2.2.2 NPPF Criteria

2.2.2.1 Paragraph 100b – demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance.

Topography

The fact that Muggeridge Field forms the eastern side of a hill gives it a particular local significance:

- From the public bridleway, people can enjoy a wonderful, panoramic view across the field and the countryside for miles beyond.
- People who live in residential areas around the field enjoy beautiful views of the field. The hill makes it visible from houses that are set back from the field, not just those that are on the field boundary. The field gives the surrounding area its semi-rural setting.
- People living further away to the south east of Horsham also benefit from the field because it screens the built up area of Horsham from them.

Beauty

Muggeridge Field is an area of open grassland bound by hedges and trees. The openness provides wonderful views across the field, giving a sense of space. It is a beautiful piece of natural landscape that protrudes into the town.

Tranquillity

Muggeridge Field is a very peaceful place that is free from traffic noise. Birdsong is usually the only sound that can be heard.

Wildlife

Natural grassland is a rare and important habitat which can support a huge variety of wildlife. Muggeridge Field is rich in wildlife. Recent sightings include deer, foxes, pheasants and badgers. Barn owls regularly fly over the field at dusk and dive to the ground to catch their prey. Nightingales have been heard and there are numerous other species of birds. Insects, including butterflies and moths, abound.

Recreational Value

The bridleway is very popular with walkers but is also used by cyclists, runners and horse riders. If the field was built on they would still be able to use the bridleway but they would lose the pleasure that they gain from everything mentioned above: the views, the beautiful scenery, the tranquillity and the wildlife. The recreational value is more to do with the benefits of being in a beautiful, tranquil, natural space than participation in a physical activity.

Muggeridge Field is within a short walking distance of densely populated residential areas. It is so important that people are able to walk to areas of tranquil, natural landscape like this.

Historic Significance

Muggeridge Field is within the Chesworth House Medieval Moated Site Archaeological Notification Area.

2.2.2.2 Paragraph 100a – in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves.

Muggeridge Field is within a short walking distance of a densely populated area of Horsham via Arun Way and the public bridleway. It also provides a semi-rural setting for the residential areas adjoining the field.

2.2.2.3 Paragraph 100c – local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

Muggeridge field is encapsulated by the town, with housing on the northern and eastern boundaries plus allotments and the public bridleway along the western boundary. Its position on the edge of the town is similar to the position of the Sports Ground in Cricket Field Road (D13), which has been included for designation as a LGS.

Muggeridge field covers an area of 4.1 hectares, so it is not an extensive tract of land. It is smaller than the Sports Ground in Cricket Field Road (D13) and similar in size to the Victory Road Recreation Ground (T5), both of which have been included for designation as a LGS.

2.2.3 Muggeridge Field has been repeatedly assessed as unsuitable for development

All previous assessments of Muggeridge Field have reached the same conclusion, that Muggeridge Field is not a suitable place for housing development. These assessments include:

- The Horsham District Deposit Draft Local Plan 1994 proposed a development of 37 dwellings on part of Muggeridge Field. Following a public enquiry the planning inspector concluded that the development would have a seriously harmful impact on the character and appearance of the open rural area to the south of the town and the proposal was unacceptable.
- In 2011, WSCC applied for outline planning permission to develop 2.8 hectares (65%) of the site with 70 dwellings (DC/11/0224). This went to appeal but was dismissed. The planning inspector said, *“I attach weight to the contribution that the development of the site would make to the supply of housing in the area. However, this would be achieved at the considerable expense of the loss of an attractive area of open countryside where the impact of the proposal would be significant. The replacement of part of the existing open area which forms a valuable green backdrop to the existing edge of town by a sub-urban housing area would have an unacceptably negative effect on the character of the area.”*
- Horsham District Landscape Capacity Assessment (Feb 2020). Muggeridge Field is in the area of land to the south of Horsham (Area 20). The assessment said, *“This area has moderate to high visual sensitivity due to its topography and has an attractive landscape character and qualities which are sensitive to large scale development. The area positively contributes to the landscape setting of Horsham and provides a key area of accessible natural green space much valued by locals.”* The overall landscape capacity for medium and large scale housing development was graded as “No/Low”.
- Horsham District Council (HDC) Regulation 18 Site Assessment Report (Feb 2020). Muggeridge Field (SHELAA Ref SA060) was graded as having “unfavourable impacts” and wasn’t selected for potential allocation for housing development.

The last two documents are part of the draft Horsham District Local Plan 2019-2036.

2.2.4 Consistency with local planning for sustainable development

The designation of Muggeridge Field as a LGS can't be judged as stopping development because:

- It hasn't been selected for potential allocation for housing development in the draft Horsham District Local Plan 2019-36.
- It has been repeatedly assessed as being unsuitable for development (see above).
- It doesn't have planning permission for development.

Therefore it satisfies the requirements of paragraphs 007 and 008 of the NPPG.

2.2.5 Provision of green space in the neighbourhood.

There are other green spaces in the vicinity of Muggeridge Field.

Bennetts Field is a recreation ground that comprises football pitches, a children's playground, a youth shelter, a ball court, and a circular tarmacked walk. It suffers from traffic noise from the main road to the south. Muggeridge Field is completely different, providing a natural landscape that is tranquil and has an abundance of wildlife.

Chesworth Farm is an extensive area of open countryside adjacent to Muggeridge Field. It consists of 13 separate fields. In many respects Muggeridge Field is indistinguishable from the fields in Chesworth Farm and it is often assumed to be part of Chesworth Farm. Most of the fields in Chesworth Farm are fenced off but 5 fields are open for people to walk over. The thing that sets Muggeridge Field apart from Chesworth Farm is that Muggeridge Field forms the top of a hill. All of the fields in Chesworth Farm are on lower lying land, with the exception of one field called "Great Horsham Hill", which forms the other side of the hill to Muggeridge Field.

Muggeridge Field provides benefits to the community that Chesworth Farm and Bennetts Field don't provide:

- As a public amenity, it provides a beautiful natural landscape that is tranquil and has an abundance of wildlife in a setting that is adjacent to the densely populated area of south-east Horsham.
- It provides people with far reaching views to the south-east (from the bridleway).
- It gives the residential areas around the field a semi-rural setting. Due to the hill, the field and the trees on the western side of the field are visible from properties set well back from the field, including some of the properties on Kerves Lane and Brighton Road and even some properties beyond Brighton Road.
- It screens the built-up area of Horsham from the countryside to the south-east.

Since these benefits are unique to Muggeridge Field, there needs to be proper provision in plans to retain Muggeridge Field as a green space.

In the Neighbourhood Plan, Muggeridge Field has been identified as part of the Green Infrastructure (GI). However, the purpose GI policy is to protect and improve the GI as a whole rather than individual parts of it. Development is permitted on GI provided there is a net gain and this net gain can be achieved in a variety of ways. So being part of the GI will not ensure that Muggeridge Field is retained as a local green space.

The only way to ensure that there is proper provision in plans to retain Muggeridge Field as a green space

is to designate it as a Local Green Space.

2.2.6 Summary of evidence

The evidence above provides a compelling case for designating Muggeridge Field as a Local Green Space:

- There is substantial support from local residents to protect it.
- It satisfies all legitimate criteria for Local Green Space designation.
- It has been repeatedly assessed as unsuitable for housing development.
- It is consistent with local planning for sustainable development.
- LGS designation is needed to ensure there is proper provision in plans for the retention of this green space, which brings unique benefits to the community.

The body of evidence is too substantial to disregard.

If you have additional representations feel free to include additional pages. Please make sure any additional pages are clearly labelled/ addressed or attached.

Do you wish to be notified of the local planning authority's decision under Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Plan (General) Regulations 2012 in relation to the Horsham Blueprint Neighbourhood Development plan?

Please tick here if you wish to be to be notified:

